

### REMARKS

This responds to the Advisory Action mailed on April 25, 2006, and the references cited therewith. Claim 9 is amended, no claims are canceled, and no claims are added; as a result, claims 1-38 remain pending in this application.

Claims 9, 37 and 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) for anticipation by Lawrence (U.S. Pat. No. 3,243,752). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection for at least the following reasons.

The rejection regarding independent claim 9 states that Lawrence discloses attaching a trace (wire 22) of conductive material to a film of flexible insulating material. Regarding Lawrence, the pending Advisory Action states that “the wire 22, sheet 24 and tube 20 are attached and assembled together as the final structure of a microcoil device (shown in Figs. 4 and 5). The pending Advisory Action further states that “clearly as the tube 20 and element 21 are rotated in the clockwise direction (annotated by the arrows in Fig. 3), the end of sheet 24 is pulled in order to wrap the sheet around the tube 20 and wires 22.”

Lawrence appears to show a number of wires 22 with an insulating coating on them wrapped around a tube 20. Lawrence also appears to show a sheet 24 of Kraft paper interleaved between the winding layers. While Applicant maintains that the claims in their present condition are sufficient to distinguish over Lawrence, in the interest of moving the application forward towards allowance Applicant has amended claim 9 to include attaching an end of the film to a mandrel prior to rolling of the mandrel. Applicant respectfully submits that Lawrence does not show sheet 24 attached to the mandrel or any other structure prior to a rolling operation. As discussed in the prior response, one clear advantage of such a configuration includes ease of manufacturing as noted in the specification in general, and at least on page 2, lines 5-29, and page 7, lines 1-10.

Because the Lawrence reference does not show every element of Applicant's independent claim 9, a 35 USC §102(b) rejection is not supported. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested with respect independent claim 9. Additionally, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested with respect to the remaining claims that depend therefrom as depending on allowable base claims.

*§103 Rejection of the Claims*

Claims 10 and 34-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lawrence in view of Wohlhieter (U.S. Patent No. 2,929,132). Applicant respectfully submits that claims 10 and 34-36 are in condition for allowance as depending from an allowable base claim.

In addition, the pending Advisory Action states that Applicant's conductive trace 45 is electrically isolated from a trace of conductive material 30 by a portion of insulating material 20 as shown in Figure 1. Applicant agrees with this statement and points out that at no point does conductive trace 45 touch conductive material 30 or in any other way make electrical conduction possible between conductive trace 45 and conductive material 30. Applicant respectfully submits that conductive trace 45 is thus "electrically isolated" from conductive material 30.

The pending Advisory Action further states that Wohlhieter "has this very same feature where the trace itself (e.g. 14) is electrically isolated from the trace of conductive material (e.g. winding 12) because a portion of insulating material (e.g. 21) is in-between trace 14 and trace 12." Applicant respectfully submits that the term "electrically isolated" does not mean that only a portion of insulating material is between traces. The term "electrically isolated" is intended to mean that no electrical conduction takes place between traces. As argued previously, Wohlhieter in Figure 1A among several other locations clearly shows an electrical attachment between terminal 14 and winding 12, thus not electrical isolation.

In contrast, claim 10 includes affixing a solderable attaching trace to the film, wherein the solderable attaching trace is electrically isolated from the trace of conducting material. Such a feature is not found in Wohlhieter, nor is it found in Lawrence, thus it cannot be found in their combination.

Because the cited references, either alone or in combination, do not show every element of Applicant's independent claims, a 35 USC § 103(a) rejection is not supported by the references. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested with respect to claims 10 and 34-36.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance, and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney at (612) 373-6944 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.


Respectfully submitted,

GERALD W. MILLS

By his Representatives,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.  
P.O. Box 2938  
Minneapolis, MN 55402  
(612) 373-6944

Date 6-1-06

By   
David C. Peterson  
Reg. No. 47,857

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being filed using the USPTO's electronic filing system EFS-Web, and is addressed to: Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 1<sup>st</sup> day of June, 2006.

PATRICIA A. HULTMAN

\_\_\_\_\_  
Name

  
Signature